REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 11, 13-15, 21-22, 24-26, 32, 34, 41, and 45-47 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-2, 21, 25-26, 32, and 41 have been amended. Claims 9, 12, and 17 have been canceled without prejudice and disclaimer. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser executable code. In response, Applicant has amended the specification to overcome the Examiner's objection.

Claims 45-47 have been objected to for introducing new matter. In response, Applicant has amended claims 45-47 to overcome the Examiner's objections with respect to claims 45-47. Support for claims 45-47 can be found in the specification on page 9, lines 11-19 of the originally filed application.

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-15, 17, 21-22, 24-26, 32, 34, 41, and 45-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,913,052 to Beatty et al. ("Beatty") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,144,962 to Weinberg et al. ("Weinberg").

Independent claim 1 relates to a method of providing a visualization of an underlying architecture of a software system within a network. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Beatty and Weinberg fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 1, namely, performing a graphical operation on a web page for dynamic visualization of graphical elements indicative of an underlying architecture of a software system. In addition, the cited combination of Beatty and Weinberg fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious wherein the dynamic visualization provides a graphical representation of collaborative interactions between architectural components of the underlying architecture of the software system.

Beatty discloses a system and method for debugging software to control a digital signal processor (DSP) and a general purpose computer employing either the system or the method. Beatty further discloses controlling a real DSP or an emulated DSP. Beatty discloses an architecture database, storable on a storage device of the general purpose computer that contains a plurality of user-selectable architectures corresponding to a plurality of DSPs, the system

7

thereby allowing the user to select a particular DSP from the database. Beatty allows the user to develop DSP software for a DSP that has not yet been produced.

Weinberg discloses a visual Web site analysis program. The program is implemented as a collection of software components for providing a variety of features for facilitating an analysis and management of Web sites and Web site content. A mapping component scans a Web site over a network connection and builds a site map which graphically depicts URLs and links of the site.

In contrast to claim 1, Beatty discloses developing DSP software for a real DSP (DSP that exists) or an emulated DSP (DSP that does not exist). According to Beatty, regardless of whether the DSP is real or emulated, the software is developed to control the DSP. The idea of developing DSP software for the emulated DSP allows the user to be able to develop DSP software for a DSP that has not yet been produced. Beatty discloses developing DSP software for a real DSP or an emulated DSP but fails to disclose displaying, on a web page, a graphical representation of an underlying architecture of a software system as claimed. In addition, Beatty discloses a system for simulating software to control a DSP. A display coupled to a memory is adapted to display an architecture of a particular DSP selected from a database in a window of a display. However, Beatty fails to disclose a graphical operation on a web page for dynamic visualization, wherein the dynamic visualization provides a graphical representation of collaborative interactions between architectural components of the underlying architecture of the software system. In contrast to claim 1, Beatty display an architecture of a particular DSP and not a graphical representation of collaborative interactions between the architectural components as in claim 1. Weinberg is focused on mapping website architecture and fails to cure the deficiencies of Beatty noted above. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 distinguishes over the cited combination of Beatty and Weinberg. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 9 and 11 have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection to claims 9 and 18 moot. Dependent claims 2-5, 7-9, 12-15, and 45-47 depend from and further restrict independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-5, 7-9, 12-15, and 45-47 distinguish over Beatty in view of Weinberg and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2-5, 7-9, 12-15, and 45-47 is respectfully requested.

8

Independent claim 32 relates to a computer-readable medium. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Beatty and Weinberg fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 32, namely, perform a graphical operation on a web page for dynamic visualization of graphical elements indicative of an underlying architecture of a software system and wherein the dynamic visualization provides a graphical representation of collaborative interactions between the architectural components of the underlying architecture of the software system.

In contrast to claim 32, Beatty discloses developing DSP software for a real DSP (DSP that exists) or an emulated DSP (DSP that does not exist). According to Beatty, regardless of whether the DSP is real or emulated, the software is developed to control the DSP. The idea of developing DSP software for the emulated DSP allows the user to be able to develop DSP software for a DSP that has not yet been produced. Beatty discloses developing DSP software for a real DSP or an emulated DSP but fails to disclose displaying, on a web page, a graphical representation of an underlying architecture of a software system as claimed. In addition, Beatty discloses a system for simulating software to control a DSP. A display coupled to a memory is adapted to display an architecture of a particular DSP selected from a database in a window of a display. However, Beatty fails to disclose a graphical operation on a web page for dynamic visualization, wherein the dynamic visualization provides a graphical representation of collaborative interactions between architectural components of the underlying architecture of the software system. In contrast to claim 32, Beatty display an architecture of a particular DSP and not a graphical representation of collaborative interactions between the architectural components as claimed in claim 32. Weinberg is focused on mapping website architecture and fails to cure the deficiencies of Beatty noted above. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 32 distinguishes over the cited combination of Beatty and Weinberg. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 32 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 34 depends from and further restrict s independent claim 32 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 32, dependent claim 34 distinguishes over Beatty in view of Weinberg and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 34 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 41 relates to an application service provider (ASP) system for visualizing an architecture of another distinct system. Applicant respectfully submits that the

9

cited combination of Beatty and Weinberg fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 41, namely, a visual display including at least one control, wherein the at least one control is adapted to perform a graphical operation on a web page for dynamic visualization of architectural components indicative of an underlying architecture. In addition, the cited combination of Beatty and Weinberg fails to disclose wherein the dynamic visualization provides a graphical representation of collaborative interactions between the architectural components of the underlying architecture.

In contrast to claim 41, Beatty discloses developing DSP software for a real DSP (DSP that exists) or an emulated DSP (DSP that does not exist). According to Beatty, regardless of whether the DSP is real or emulated, the software is developed to control the DSP. The idea of developing DSP software for the emulated DSP allows the user to be able to develop DSP software for a DSP that has not yet been produced. Beatty discloses developing DSP software for a real DSP or an emulated DSP but fails to disclose displaying, on a web page, a graphical representation of an underlying architecture of a software system as claimed. In addition, Beatty discloses a system for simulating software to control a DSP. A display coupled to a memory is adapted to display an architecture of a particular DSP selected from a database in a window of a display. However, Beatty fails to disclose a graphical operation on a web page for dynamic visualization, wherein the dynamic visualization provides a graphical representation of collaborative interactions between the architectural components of the underlying architecture. In contrast to claim 32, Beatty display an architecture of a particular DSP and not a graphical representation of collaborative interactions between the architectural components as claimed in claim 41. Weinberg fails to cure the deficiencies of Beatty noted above. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 41 distinguishes over the cited combination of Beatty and Weinberg. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 41 is respectfully requested.

In addition, neither Beatty nor Weinberg teach a system for visualizing an architecture of *another distinct system*. Instead, Beatty teaches debugging a Digital Signal Processor (DSP) of a computer running the simulation. *See* Beatty, Figure 1 and col. 4, line 54-col. 5, line 11. Similarly, Weinberg teaches mapping a web site to analyze content and links to URLs and therefore Weinberg does not teach visualizing an architecture of another distinct system. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 41 as being unpatentable over Beatty and Weinberg is respectfully requested for this additional reason.

Dependent claim 17 has been canceled, thus rendering the rejections thereof moot. Dependent claim Dependent claims 21-22, and 24-26 depend from and further restrict independent claim 41 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 41, dependent claims 18, 21-22, and 24-26 distinguish over Beatty in view of Weinberg and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 21-22, and 24-26 is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: _April 1, 2006_

Respectfully submitted,

By _Stanley R. Moore_

Stanley R. Moore
   Registration No.: 26,958
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
   CORPORATION
1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3700
Dallas, Texas 75202
(214) 855-4500
Attorneys For Applicant